

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claim 8 is amended the claim a method for generating metadata for a number of parameters including a roll clockwise operation and a roll anticlockwise operation (specification, page 10, lines 6-12). The description of specifying that the generated metadata is defined in view of temporal information is disclosed in the specification on page 11, lines 5-10, and in other places. The claim is amended also as for a sequence of images as to clarify the scope of the claim.

Claim 10 is cancelled.

Claim 11 is amended to claim that the generated metadata is compatible with an MPEG-7 compatible format (see Summary of the Invention).

Claim 12 is amended to include both roll clockwise and roll anticlockwise operations (page 10, lines 6-12).

Claim 13 is amended to specify that the generated signal is to be stored on a storage medium and is to support a computer application (see Summary of the Invention). In addition, the generated metadata is compatible with an MPEG-7 compatible format (also Summary of the Invention).

Claims 17 and 18 define the addition where metadata is generated or describes camera motion parameters of either two modes: a mixture and a non-mixture mode. These two modes are defined in the specification on page 10, line 15 to page 11, line 3.

No new matter was added in view of these amendments.

**I. Rejection of the Drawings**

The Examiner requested that the Applicants provide drawings as disclosing the elements of Claims 15 and 16. Applicants assert that the elements of Claims 15 and 16 are already disclosed, albeit in a table, on page 12, lines 12-16 of the specification. Applicants believe that the inclusion of this table in the form of a drawing would be repetitive and unnecessary for one skilled in the art to understand the principles of the present invention and would not facilitate the requirements of drawings as defined under 35 U.S.C. 113 and 37 C.F.R. 1.81(a).

Applicants request that the Examiner remove the objection to the drawings.

## **II. Rejection of Claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. 101**

The Examiner rejected Claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as the claimed invention is directed towards non-statutory subject matter. As amended, Claim 13 is directed toward a signal that "is capable of being stored on a storage medium" and said signal is used for a computer application (a stated purpose such a query operation).

Applicants request that the Examiner remove the rejection to Claim 13 as the subject matter of the claim is defined as to overcome the Examiner's utility rejection. In addition, the rejection to Claim 14-16 should be removed as such claims depend of allowable Claim 13.

## **III. Rejection of Claims 8 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102**

The Examiner rejected Claims 8 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Miyatake et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,267,034, hereafter referred to as Miyatake). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

Claim 8, as amended, incorporates an inclusion of estimating a roll clockwise operation, and a roll anticlockwise operation. This type of camera

motion operation of rotation is not disclosed or suggested in Miyatake (see Fig. 1, table 19, and col. 4, lines 55-65). In addition, the claimed values (for all of the listed camera motion types) are used as metadata are determined in view of "calculating a ratio that corresponds to a length of time a specific motion type occurs for said sequence of images divided by a time length corresponding to said sequence of frames." This ratio is neither disclosed nor suggested in Miyatake.

Claim 12 likewise incorporates an inclusion of estimating a roll clockwise operation, and a roll anticlockwise operation. This type of camera motion operation of rotation is not disclosed or suggested in Miyatake (see Fig. 1, table 19, and col. 4, lines 55-65).

Applicants request for the reasons listed above that the Examiner remove the rejection to Claims 8 and 12.

#### **IV. Rejection of Claims 9, 11, and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103**

The Examiner rejected Claims 9, 11, and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Miyatake. Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

The Examiner correctly writes in the Office Action that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is taken in view of the subject matter to be patentable what "would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains". That is, the Examiner must consider was known "at the time of invention" in order to make a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The Examiner takes official notice in the rejection of Claims 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16 in view of the Miyatake reference to make the obvious rejection. Applicants request that the Examiner establish that all claimed elements of these rejected claims were known to one of the ordinary skill of the art at the

time of the invention by citing to specific documentary evidence or some other independent reference establishing what one at the ordinary skill in the art would have known at the time of the invention.


In addition, the claimed features of having metadata comporting to an MPEG-7 format, as now claimed in claims 11 and 13 is neither disclosed or suggested to by the Examiner, alone or in combination with Miyatake and the Examiner's official notice observations.

For the reasons given above, the Applicants assert that Claims 9, 11, and 13-16 are patentable for the reasons given above. Also, Applicants assert that new Claims 17-18 are patentable, as such claims have features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited art of record.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at (609) 734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

The Applicants are filing this amendment and response on November 21, 2005 (a Monday) with a three month extension under 37 C.F.R. 1.116(a) (November 19, 2005, which was six months from the mailing date of May 19, 2005, fell on a Saturday). Please charge the fee for this extension and any other fees owed in connection with this response to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
 Joel M. Fogelson  
 Reg. No. 43,613

Phone (609) 734-6809

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing Inc.  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312  
November 21, 2005